

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENITED STATES DEPAREMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark, Office address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 VIVW. 19816. gov.

APPLICATION N	Ю.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,317	10/031,317 01/16/2002		Tomohide Takeuchi	52433/675	5887
26646	7590	[1/19/2003		EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON ONE BROADWAY				MCHENRY, KEVIN L	
NEW YORK, NY 10004				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1725	

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/031,317	TAKEUCHI ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Kevin L McHenry	1725
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	he correspondence address
A SHO THE N - Exter after: - If the - If NO - Failur - Any re earne Status	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply till, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing diplement term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	16(a). In no event, however, may a reply by within the statutory minimum of thirth, (30) ill apply and will expire SIX (8) MONTHS cause the application to become ABANDI date of this communication, even if timely	be timely filed ) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication.
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 A	<u>ugust 2003</u> .	
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.	
3)□ Dispositie	Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under £ on of Claims	nce except for formal matters Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	, prosecution as to the merits is 1, 453 O.G. 213.
4)🖾	Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.		
2	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.	
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,2,4 and 5</u> is/are rejected.		
7)🖂	Claim(s) <u>3</u> is/are objected to.		
8)∐ Applicatio	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or papers	election requirement.	
9)[] T	he specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accept		Yaminer
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11)[] T	he proposed drawing correction filed on		
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in repl		
12)[] T	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa		
riority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) 🗌 🔏	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).
	All b) Some * c) None of:	_	
1	Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		ation No.
3	Copies of the certified copies of the priorit application from the International Bure se the attached detailed Office action for a list of	y documents have been rece	ived in this National Stage
14)∏ Ac	knowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	nriority under 35 H.S.C. 8 444	O(a) (ta a provinienal annilis (f)
a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language provi knowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	sional application has been re	eceived.
ttachment(s		priority under 35 0.5.0, 99 1.	20 and/0f 121.
Notice	, of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		ary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) al Patent Application (PTO-152)
Patent and Trad		on Summary	Part of Paper No. 111203

Art Unit: 1725

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/35775 in view of JP 4-342,468.

WO 98/35775 teaches a ceramic plate material for the side dams of a twin-drum strip caster. This reference teaches that the ceramic plate material can be made of various suitable ceramic materials, such as BN-Si<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> (see WO 98/35775; particularly Figures 1, 2a-2c, 3; page 8).

WO 98/35775 does not teach a ceramic plate material with the combination of composition and properties claimed by the applicant.

JP 4-342,468 teaches a ceramic that is suitable for use in the continuous casting of carbon steel, stainless steel, and high alloy steel. JP 4-342,468 teaches that the ceramic has a composition of 5-70 wt% BN, 25-75 wt%  $Si_3N_4$ , and 3-35 wt% AlN. This reference also teaches that a spinel, such as  $MgO \cdot Al_2O_3$ , is added in an amount of 1-15 wt%. JP 4-342,468 teaches that this ceramic composition is advantageous over prior art BN-  $Si_3N_4$  ceramics because it provides improved corrosion resistance and improved strength (see JP 4-342,468; particularly abstract; pages 2-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the applicant's invention was made to have modified the plate material of WO 98/35775 by

Art Unit: 1725

the teachings of JP 4-342,468. One would have been motivated to do so in order to use a ceramic material and composition that provided improved corrosion resistance and strength, as taught by JP 4-342,468. The examiner notes that the ceramic plate material taught above reads upon the composition claimed by the applicant and would therefore have the same mechanical, thermal, and fluid properties claimed by the applicant.

### Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the instant application is deemed to be directed to a nonobvious improvement over the invention patented in JP 07-68,354. The improvement comprises a ceramic plate for the side damn of a twin-roll strip caster that consists of 5% to 20% BN, more than 15% to 40% AlN, and 40% to 80% Si<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>, all percentages in mass percent.

#### Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. JP 03-207,554, JP 07-60,411, JP 07-68,354, JP 09-155,509, JP 01-278,944, and JP 09-51,669 are cited for illustrating the state of the art in ceramic compositions for continuous casting.
- 6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1725

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 22 August 2003 have been fully considered but they
are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the claimed ceramic plate material, particularly its properties, is not taught by the references cited in the rejection. However, the references noted in rejection above teach the claimed ceramic plate, particularly a ceramic plate with an Al equivalent mass% of 9% or more. As noted in the applicant's specification on page 5, lines 24-30, such an Al equivalent is met by a ceramic composition with 15%-40% AlN. The references noted above teach 3-35 wt% AlN. Therefore, these references teach the cited ceramic plate material with an Al equivalent of 9% or more. The ceramic plate taught by these references will therefore have the same properties as the ceramic plate cited by the applicant. The references noted in the rejection also meet the cited limitations for BN content and for containing alumina, magnesia, zirconia, or yittria.

Art Unit: 1725

The examiner notes that claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 use broad language for the composition of the ceramic plate and does not limit the composition of the ceramic plate to the composition that is cited in these claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin L McHenry whose telephone number is (703) 305-9626. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas G Dunn can be reached on (703) 308-3318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1234.

This Millerry

Kevin McHenry

Copp. S.